

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/551,191	09/29/2005	Barry Raymond Hill	021500-140	3920	
21839 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			AKANBI, ISIAKA O		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				•	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/09/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail $\,$ address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/551,191		HILL ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ISIAKA O. AKANBI	2886		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

- 1. \(\) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee bunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from; (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

- 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
 - appeal; and/or

 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
- Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7.
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s), a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 - The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 - Claim(s) allowed: ______
 - Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-17 and 19-21.
 - Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. I The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. \(\bigcirc \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
- 13. Other: .

/Roy M. Punnoose/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2886 Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant's arguments and the decoration, see page 7-9, with respect to claims 1-17 and 19-21 rejection have been fully considered but are not persuavise. In response to Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 and 19-21 rejection, it is respectfully pointed out to applicant that this argument is not persuasive as the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPO2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

As to the newly amended limitations such as, "the virtual image plane being located between the light source and a camera" to the virtual shadow graph image of the quizing being located between the light source and a camera." In limiting of the quizing being located between the light source and a camera." In limit a 1 and 19 would require further consideration and/or search to define patentibility since previously presented claims explicitly lack these limitations, which not only changes the scope of the independent claims but also the dependent claims.